



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,752	11/19/2003	Timothy L. Coder	16076-002002	8764
26161	7590	07/11/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			VAN PELT, BRADLEY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3682	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,752

Applicant(s)

CODER ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley J. Van Pelt

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28, 36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28, 36 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

7

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 15-28, 36 and 37 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,973. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are obvious variations of breadth and scope.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heller (USPN 3,565,213).

Heller discloses a lubricator to apply lubricant to a strand (20) as it is pulled through a conduit, the lubricator including a coupling feature (14) to mate with a corresponding coupling feature (corresponding threads) of a bushing;

the strand comprises an insulated electrical wire or the like;

the coupling feature of the lubricator comprises threads;

the threads comprise external threads;

the lubricator also includes a second coupling (15) feature configured to mate with a corresponding coupling feature of the conduit;

the second coupling feature of the lubricator comprises threads;

the threads comprise internal threads;

a body of the lubricator is formed of two connectable components (16, 11);

a lubricator to apply lubricant to a strand as it is pulled through a conduit, the lubricator including an external thread to mate with a corresponding internal thread (14) of a bushing, and an internal thread (15) to mate with a corresponding external thread (13) of the conduit.

5. Claims 24, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Charlton (USPN 4,296,837).

Charlton discloses a lubricator to apply lubricant to a strand as it is pulled through a conduit, the lubricator comprising two body sections (18, 16) that can be connected to one another to form the lubricator, each of the body sections comprising a sleeve (20), the sleeves of the two body sections being aligned when the two body sections are connected to form the body, and a pin (hinge pin through 20) that slides into the sleeves to hold the body sections together;

the lubricator includes an axis that is aligned along the length of the strand and the pin includes an axis that is parallel to the lubricator axis;
electrical wire.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 26, 27, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlton in view of Mefferd (USPN 5,269,572).

Charlton discloses all of the instantly claimed invention except a second pin and respective sleeves.

Mefferd discloses a second pin (104).

To modify the apparatus of Charlton so as to provide a second pin would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the

teachings of Mefferd that such an arrangement improves the ability of the device to be quickly connected and disconnected.

8. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlton in view of Mefferd and Oetiker (USPN 4,693,502).

The Charlton and Mefferd combination (see above) show all of the instantly claimed invention except a seal.

Oetiker shows a seal (15).

To modify the reference combination above so as to provide a seal would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the teachings of Oetiker that such an arrangement improves the ability to contain flow, making the process more efficient.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Since no terminal disclaimer was located in the file, the double patenting rejection remains proper.

The applicant argues that claim 15 is patentable, because Heller reference does not disclose "a bushing." Sections 10 and 11 are bushings. According to the Merriam-Webster OnLine dictionary a bushing is "a usually removable cylindrical lining for an opening (as of a mechanical part) used to limit the size of the opening, resist abrasion, or serve as a guide." Section 10 and 11 are "removable cylindrical lining[s] for an opening [] [opening of 16] used to

limit the size of the opening [] and serve as a guide[s].” Thus sections 10 and 11 are bushings and Heller anticipates this limitation.

The applicant argues that claim 23 is patentable because Heller does not disclose an external thread. Heller discloses both internal and external threads. External threads are disposed on pipe sections 10 and 11 and internal threads are disposed on coupling 16. Coupling 16 is also a bushing because it is removable and it serves as a guide for the strand. Heller, therefore, also anticipates claim 23.

The applicant argues that claim 24 is patentable over the Charlton reference, because the hinge pin of Charlton permanently connects the two half sections 16 and 18. The hinge pin of Charlton is removable. Anticipation of a removable pin is not precluded by the fact that it might require a tool or tools to remove the pin of hinge 20. Thus Charlton anticipates this limitation.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 3682

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley J. Van Pelt whose telephone number is (571)272-7113.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Bucci can be reached on (571)272-7099. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BJVP



DAVID A. BUCCI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600